

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 81, 86, 92, 105, 108, and 113 are currently amended, and claims 7, 11, 13, 20, and 24 are withdrawn-currently amended. Claims 1-30 and 81-113 are pending after entry of this Amendment.

No new matter is introduced by this Amendment. Amended claims 108 and 113 are supported at least by FIG. 8 of the originally-filed specification.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the remarks presented below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 12, 81-84, 86, 92, 94-113 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 3,211,354 ("Dugard") in view of U.S. 4,269,343 ("Siegel") and U.S. 5,395,046 ("Knobbe").

Claims 1, 12, 81, 86, 92 and 105 have been amended. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

an opening in an exterior side of an exterior-most wall of the first handle, the opening defining a cavity adapted to releasably receive the storage...

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite:

an opening in an exterior side of an exterior-most wall of the first handle, the opening defining a cavity adapted to accept the storage...

Independent claim 81 has been amended to recite:

a recess in an exterior side of an exterior-most wall of the first handle, the recess defining a cavity to releasably receive the storage...

Independent claim 86 has been amended to recite:

an opening in an exterior side of an exterior-most wall of the handle, the opening defining a cavity sized to receive the storage...

Independent claim 92 has been amended to recite:

an opening in an exterior side of an exterior-most wall of the first handle, the opening defining a portion of a cavity, the cavity adapted to releasably receive the storage through the opening...

Independent claim 105 has been amended to recite:

an exterior-most wall of the first handle having a recess in an exterior side of the exterior-most wall, the recess defining a solder collection storage cartridge cavity...

Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach these limitations. In the Office Action of May 16, 2007, page 3, the Examiner stated that “Dugard does not teach an opening at the exterior side of the exterior-most wall of the handle” (emphasis in original). As indicated above, Applicant has added “an opening at an exterior side of an exterior-most wall” in independent claims 1, 12, 86, and 92. Siegel and Knobbe fail to cure this deficiency of Dugard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 12, 86, and 92 are patentably allowable over Dugard in view of Siegel and Knobbe.

Dugard also fails to teach or suggest “a recess at an exterior side of an exterior-most wall, the recess defining a cavity to releasably receive the storage,” as required by claim 81, and “a recess in an exterior side of the exterior-most wall, the recess defining a solder collection storage cartridge cavity,” as required in claim 105. Siegel and Knobbe fail to cure this deficiency of Dugard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 81 and 105 are patentably allowable over Dugard in view of Siegel and Knobbe.

Claims 82-84 depend from claim 81. Claim 94 depends from claim 92. Claims 95-100 depend from claim 1. Claim 101 depends from claim 12. Claims 102-104 depend from claim 92. Claims 106-113 depend from claim 105. As indicated above, claims 1, 12, 81, 92, and 105 are patentably allowable over Dugard in view of Siegel and Knobbe. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 82-84, 94-102, and 106-113 are patentably allowable over Dugard in view of Siegel and Knobbe for at least the same reason as claims 1, 12, 81, 92, or 105, respectively.

In addition, claims 108 and 113 have been amended to recite: "the radiation member having a surface spaced apart from the housing and an edge attached to the housing." Dugard, Siegel, and Knobbe, individually and when combined, fail to teach these limitations. For this additional reason, Applicant submits that claims 108 and 113 are patentably allowable over Dugard in view of Siegel and Knobbe.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing claim amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

July 17, 2007

Norman Morales

Norman Morales
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.55,463

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
ONE MARITIME PLAZA
SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FACSIMILE (415) 393-9887
TELEPHONE (415) 954-0200